Spatial localization in a two-particles quantum walk with time-dependent noise

I. Márquez-Martín[1], G. Di Molfetta[1,2], and A. Pérez[1]
[1] *Departamento de Física Teórica and IFIC, Universidad de Valencia-CSIC, Dr. Moliner 50, 46100-Burjassot, Spain*
[2] *Aix-Marseille Universite, CNRS, Laboratoire d'Informatique Fondamentale, Marseille, France*

We study the role played by noise on the bounded state of a two-particle QW with interaction, as introduced in [1]. The bounded ("molecular") state can be effectively described as a one-particle QW in 1D, with a coin operator which depends on the extra phase that is acquired by the interaction at each time step. The noise is introduced by a random change in the value of the phase during the evolution, from a constant probability distribution within a given interval. The consequences of introducing such kind of noise depend on both the center value and the width of that interval: a wider interval manifests as a higher level of noise. The center value is also important for the fate of the molecular state (as noise increases). Depending on this value, the molecule can be destroyed. More interestingly, one can also find some range of parameters for which the bound state survives under the form of a localized state, a situation that can be related to the violation of the stability criterion of the molecule. The existence of this localized state for such kind of *time-dependent* noise is, to the best of our knowledge, totally new, since localization (i.e., Anderson localization) is linked in the literature to a *spatial random* noise.

arXiv:1611.08718v1 [quant-ph] 26 Nov 2016

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum walks (QWs) are formal quantum analogues of classical random walks. QWs were first considered by Grössing and Zeilinger [2] in 1988, as simple quantum cellular automata in one-particle sector. They were popularized in the physics community in 1993, by Y. Aharonov [3], who started studying them systematically and described some of their main properties. The formalism was then developed a fews years later by D.A. Meyer [4], in the context of quantum information. From a physical perspective, QWs describe situations where a quantum particle is taking steps on a lattice conditioned on its internal state, typically a (pseudo) spin one half system. The particle dynamically explores a large Hilbert space associated with the positions of the lattice and allows thus to simulate a wide range of transport phenomena [5]. With QWs, the transport is driven by an external discrete unitary operation, which sets it apart from other lattice quantum simulation concepts where transport typically rests on tunneling between adjacent sites [6]: all dynamic processes are discrete in space and time. As models of coherent quantum transport, QWs are interesting both for fundamental quantum physics and for applications. An important field of applications is quantum algorithmic [7]. QWs were first conceived as the natural tool to explore graphs, for example for efficient data searching (see e.g. [8]). QWs are also useful in condensed matter applications and topological phases [9]. A totally new emergent point of view concerning QWs concerns quantum simulation of gauge fields and high-energy physical laws [10, 11]. It is important to note that QWs can be realized experimentally with a wide range of physical objects and setups, for example as transport of photons in optical networks or optical fibers [12], or of atoms in optical lattices [13]. Although most of these families of QWs represent and model the one-particle dynamics, implementation of the two-particle sector have been investigated and studied by several authors [14]. In particular a two-particle QW, modeling an atom-atom binding in free space, has been already introduced by [1] in a very general framework.

The main aim of this letter, inspired by [1], is to introduce dynamical noise in the interacting term between the pair of QWs, by numerically studying the robustness of the molecular states. QWs with random noise have already been considered by several authors (see for example [15, 16]), but the influence of dynamical noise on bounded two-particles QWs has never been the object of a specific study. In particular, we study the effect of the noise on the molecule in function of the strength of the noise itself. Surprisingly, for some family of noise the bounded state survives under the form of a localized state. The existence of this local-

ized state for such kind of time-dependent noise is, to the best of our knowledge, totally new, since localization (i.e., Anderson localization) has been observed and studied in spatial random environment. We also support all results by direct numerical simulations of the average dynamics.

The letter is organized as follows. Sect. II is devoted to the definition of the model on a line in the one particle sector (II A) and in the two particle sector (II B). Sect. III is devoted to the definition of the interacting two-particles QW and its numerical simulations. Following [1], we recall in this section the effective model for the stable bounded states (the molecule). In section IV we study numerically the behavior of the molecule in a dynamical random environment, and the existence of localised states. Finally, Sect. V summarizes our conclusions.

II. QUANTUM WALK ON A LINE

A. One-particle discrete time quantum walk (DTQW)

The dynamics of the QW takes place on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_p \otimes \mathcal{H}_c$ where $\mathcal{H}_p$ is defined over $\mathcal{Z}^d$ and $\mathcal{H}_c$ corresponds to the internal degree of freedom, which is usually referred to as the coin space, with basis $\{|c_i\rangle\}_{i\in\mathcal{K}=[1,..,k]}$. In the simplest case, it could describe a particle moving in a lattice of dimension d, and the coin could correspond to the spin. The unitary matrix which describes the evolution is $U = S(\mathbb{I}\otimes C)$. This operator acts on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ as a conditional position shift operator, with the coin acting as a control qubit [17], which means that S will shift the position of the particle to the right if the coin points up, and to the left, if the coin points down. Therefore, choosing $d = 1$:

$$S = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{Z},} |i+1\rangle\langle i|\otimes|\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow| + |i-1\rangle\langle i|\otimes|\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow| \quad (1)$$

$\mathbb{I}\otimes C$ acts nontrivially only on the coin space $\mathcal{H}_c$, corresponding to flipping the coin. $\mathcal{H}$ is spanned by the orthonormal basis $\{|i\rangle\otimes|c\rangle : i\in\mathbb{Z}, c\in\uparrow,\downarrow\}$. C is chosen as an element of $SU(2)$. The usual choice for this matrix is given by the so called Hadamard coin:

$$C_H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

After t steps taken by the walker, the state becomes $|\Psi_t\rangle = U^t|\Psi_0\rangle$.

B. Two-particle quantum walk

Let us consider the previous QW, but now with two non-interacting particles on a line [18]. Although this case can give rise to new interesting phenomena, the mathematical description is quite similar to the simple QW. The joint Hilbert space of our composite system is given by:

$$\mathcal{H}_{12} = \mathcal{H}_1\otimes\mathcal{H}_2 = \mathcal{H}_{p_1}\otimes\mathcal{H}_{c_1}\otimes\mathcal{H}_{p_2}\otimes\mathcal{H}_{c_2}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_2$ represent the Hilbert spaces of particles 1 and 2. These spaces are described as in the previous Sect. Note also that in the case of identical particles, we need to restrict $\mathcal{H}_{12}$ to its symmetrical or anti symmetrical subspaces for bosons or fermions, respectively. Therefore, each step of this two-particle QW will be implemented by the unitary operator:

$$U_{12} \equiv U_1\otimes U_2 = S_1(\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{P}_1}\otimes C_1)\otimes S_2(\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{P}_2}\otimes C_2), \quad (4)$$

where C_k will be by the Hadamard coin operator for particle $k = 1, 2$.

As there are two particles, the composed Hadamard operator $C_{12} = C_1\otimes C_2$ is given by:

$$C_{12} = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

The evolution after t steps is described by $|\Psi_t\rangle = U_{12}^t|\Psi_0\rangle$. As this operator acts over both particles, the transformation in the coin space will be a superposition of up and down states in both subspaces. The shift operators will act shifting by ±1 in position for each particle, depending on the state of the coin. We will use the notation $\Psi(i,j;t)$ for the four-spinor at point (i,j), where $i\in\mathbb{Z}$ corresponds to the first particle, and $j\in\mathbb{Z}$ to the second one.

III. INTERACTING QUANTUM WALK (INTQW)

Let us consider the case in which there is an interaction between the particles. The model introduced by [1] predicts a new phenomenon, known as molecular binding in the QW. It can be described as a molecular bound state of two "atoms" walking along a line. In this model, the interaction is mediated through an on-site contact potential, which means that the system moves under the influence of a periodic driving force acting only when the particles are at the same point on the $i = j$ line.

Mathematically, the system will be described in terms of the non-interacting two particles walk $U_0 = U_1 \otimes U_2$. However, at the contact points, $i = j$, the interaction potential picks an additional e^{ig} phase factor. Fig.1 represents the joint probability distribution. The main feature is that the probability is concentrated along the diagonal $i = j$. This behavior reveals that the interaction between the two particles form a bound state, acting as a molecule, which dynamics is described by a one-particle QW [1].

Analytical solution for the bound state We start by defining the spinor in the quasi-momentum representation $\psi(p_1, p_2; t)$ via Fourier transformation of the corresponding spinor in physical space $\Psi(i, j; t)$, i.e.

$$\psi(p_1, p_2; t) = \sum_{m,n} \Psi(n, m; t) e^{i(p_1 n + p_2 m)} \tag{6}$$

The generator of joint translations is the total quasi-momentum $p = p_1 + p_2$, which hence commutes with the walk operator. This means that the diagonalization of the unitary operator U_{12}^I, can be done separately for each value of the conserved quantity p, and one is left with a problem in a space of the wave functions depending on the relative momentum $k = (p_1 - p_2)/2$, with p treated as a fixed parameter. The molecule bound state can be obtained from a study of the energy spectrum of the system. These results are important for us to understand the behavior of the system for different types of noise. By following [1] one obtains, for the bound state, the eigenvalues $e^{i\omega}$ given by:



Figure 1. Probability distribution of two-particles IntQW with initial condition $|\psi^-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0,\downarrow\rangle_1 |0,\uparrow\rangle_2 - |0,\uparrow\rangle_1 |0,\downarrow\rangle_2)$ and different interaction phases: $g = \pi$ (top) and $g = \pi/2$ (bottom).

$$e^{i\omega} = \frac{e^{ig}}{2e^{ig} - 1}\Big(\cos(p) \pm i\sqrt{\sin^2 p + 4(1 - \cos g)}\Big) \tag{7}$$

$$\text{with} \quad \sin\omega \cdot \sin(g - \omega) > 0. \tag{8}$$

A. Effective molecule dynamics

In order to study the properties of the bound state, it is possible to restrict ourselves to the molecule degrees of freedom by constructing an effective operator. We can write the overall wave function of the molecule as:

$$\psi(p,k) = \phi_+(p)\chi_p^+(k) + \phi_-(p)\chi_p^-(k), \quad (9)$$

where the factors $\chi_p^\pm$ play the role of a 'spinor basis' for the space of internal states of the molecule, and $\phi_\pm(p)$ are determined by the branches $\omega_\pm(p)$ of the quasi-energy, Eq. (7). One has $\phi_\pm = 0$ whenever the corresponding branch is ruled out by Eq.(8). The evolution after t time steps can be written in terms of an effective operator W_{eff}, such that

$$(W_{eff}^t\psi)(p,k) \equiv e^{i\omega_+(p)t}\chi_p^+(k)\phi_+(p) + e^{i\omega_-(p)t}\chi_p^-(k)\phi_-(p). \quad (10)$$

which describes a discrete time evolution on a lattice, with two degrees of freedom, although some internal states may be forbidden for some values of p, due to the constraint Eq.(8). It turns out that W_{eff} is a QW because it can be decomposed into a single shift and a coin operation: $W_{eff} = S(\mathbb{I}\otimes C)$ where S is the shift operator of the 1D quantum walk (1), and a 2×2 coin matrix operator C_g:

$$C_g = \frac{1}{2e^{ig}-1}\begin{pmatrix} e^{ig} & \sqrt{2}(e^{ig}-1) \\ \sqrt{2}(e^{ig}-1)e^{ig} & e^{ig} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

We can reduce the study of the two-particle QW to an effective 1D QW which has the same properties as the molecular bound state formed in the diagonal $i = j$. This description of the bound state will be very useful in section IV, in which we introduce noise in the interacting QW model. As expected, one obtains the same dispersion relation (7) from this reduced QW.

IV. QUANTUM DECOHERENCE IN THE INTERACTING QUANTUM WALK

The main goal in this paper is the introduction of dynamical noise. In order to see how the system responds to this kind of noise, we numerically simulate its evolution using the same equations as in the noiseless case, but randomly change the parameter g at every step within the interval $[g_0+\epsilon, g_0-\epsilon]$, where g_0 is the value without noise. The entire procedure is repeated over a number of N_s iterations, and the result is averaged over these samplings. When $g_0 = \frac{\pi}{2}$, Fig.2 shows how the probability density changes for different values of ϵ. The molecule bound state is progressively destroyed as ϵ increases, but keeps a similar behavior as in the noninteracting case.



Figure 2. Probability density for different values of ϵ: $\epsilon = \frac{\pi}{8}$ (top) and $\epsilon = \frac{\pi}{4}$ (bottom). The number of steps is $t = 100$. As ϵ increases the noise increases too. In this case, the bound state is destroyed. The probability distribution is obtained by averaging over $N_s = 100$ samples.

Let us consider a different value of g_0 to get more insight about the robustness of the molecular bound state. Now, Fig.3 shows the density probability for $g_0 = \pi$. As before, the molecule stops showing a quantum walk pattern, but now the bound state behaves quite differently than in the previous case. While for $g_0 = \pi/2$ the molecule

is destroyed, now for the same type of noise the probability in the diagonal $i = j$ becomes a **localized state** around the origin, as ϵ increases.



Figure 3. Probability density for $\epsilon = \frac{\pi}{8}$ (top) and $\epsilon = \frac{\pi}{4}$ (bottom), both with $g_0 = \pi$. In this case, the behavior of the bound state is completely different than the $g_0 = \pi/2$ case. The molecule, instead of being destroyed, remains on the diagonal, while the probability density is concentrated around the origin. The number of steps is $t = 100$, and the number of samples $N_s = 100$.

There is, in fact, an important difference between the cases with $g_0 = \pi/2$ and $g_0 = \pi$ concerning the quasi-energy condition given by (8). This condition restricts the values of ω that are allowed for a given value of g. Plotting this condition, for $g_0 = \pi/2$ and for $g_0 = \pi$ with different strengths of the noise, shows that in the case $g_0 = \pi/2$ there are regions for which the condition $\sin(\omega)\sin(g - \omega) > 0$ is violated, as can be seen from Fig. 4. This may be the reason why the molecular bound state vanishes so quickly when noise is introduced in the system: there are values of the interaction phase which are not allowed, so decoherence destroys completely the bound state of the system.



Figure 4. Averaged plot of $\sin(\omega)\sin(g-\omega)$ for different noise intervals: $g_0 = \pi$(left) and $g_0 = \frac{\pi}{2}$ (right), $\epsilon = \frac{\pi}{8}$ (top) and $\epsilon = \frac{\pi}{4}$ (bottom). The number of steps is $t = 100$, and the number of samples $N_s = 400$.

Let us focus on the case with $g_0 = \pi$. It is important to study in more detail how the bound state changes depending on time. For this purpose, we can restrict ourselves to the reduced 1D QW defined by the effective operator $U_{eff} = S(1 \otimes C_g)$, where S is the shift operator along an axis which we arbitrarily label as x, and C_g is defined in Eq. (11). This effective operator allows us to see what happens to the bound state when there is noise in the interaction. As the system is mathematically simpler, we can perform simulations with a larger number of steps, which is useful in order to check if the bound state becomes localized for $g_0 = \pi$. Figs (5,6) confirm the localization around $x = 0$ as the noise increases. The first one is simply the probability density for $t = 400$ steps, and we can see the same change in shape as in Fig.3.

On the other hand, Fig.6 shows how the probability density changes over t. We can observe how the probability concentrates around $x = 0$. In fact, this evolution reminds us the phenomenon of Anderson localization.

The result is intriguing due to the fact that dynamical noise is expected to transform the system into a classical random walk, but in this case we see some type of dynamical localization. Anderson



Figure 5. Probability density for different values of ϵ: $\epsilon = \frac{\pi}{8}$ (top) and $\epsilon = \frac{\pi}{2}$ (bottom) for $t = 400$, and a number of samples $N_s = 100$.



Figure 6. Color density plot showing the evolution of the probability density as a function of t (horizontal axis). The vertical axis corresponds to the position along the effective 1D QW. Brighter regions indicate a higher probability. As ϵ increases, the probability density concentrates around $x = 0$: $\epsilon = \frac{\pi}{10}$ (top-left), $\epsilon = \frac{\pi}{8}$ (top-right), $\epsilon = \frac{\pi}{6}$ (bottom-left), $\epsilon = \frac{\pi}{4}$ (bottom-right). $N_s = 100$.

localization has extensively been studied [19, 20] as the result of introducing a static disorder. What we obtained here, however, is a similar result, but produced by a time-dependent noise. This is the main result of our paper.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we investigated the role played by noise on the bounded state of a two-particle QW with interaction, as introduced in [1]. The bounded state can be effectively described as a one-particle QW in 1D, with a coin operator C_g which depends on the extra phase that is acquired by the interaction at each time step. The noise is introduced by a random change in the value of g during the evolution, from a constant probability distribution within a given interval. The consequences of introducing such kind of noise depend on both the center value and the width of that interval: a wider interval manifests as a higher level of noise. The center value is also important for the fate of the molecular state (as noise increases). Depending on this value, the molecule can be destroyed. More interestingly, one can also find some range of parameters for which the bound state survives under the form of a localized state, a situation that can be related to the violation of the stability criterion of the molecule. The existence of this localized state for such kind of *time-dependent* noise is, to the best of our knowledge, totally new, since localization (i.e., Anderson localization) is linked in the literature to a *spatial random* noise.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work has been supported by the Spanish Ministerio de Educación e Innovación, MICIN-FEDER project FPA2014-54459-P, SEV-2014-0398 and Generalitat Valenciana Grant GVPROMETEOII2014-087.

[1] A. Ahlbrecht, A. Alberti, D. Meschede, V. B. Scholz, A. H. Werner, and R. F. Werner, New Journal of Physics **14** (2012), 10.1088/1367-2630/14/7/073050, arXiv:1105.1051.

[2] G. Grossing and A. Zeilinger, Complex Systems **2**, 197 (1988).

[3] N. Z. Y. Aharonov, L. Davidovich, Physical Review A **48**, 1687 (1993), arXiv:1207.4535v1.

[4] D. A. Meyer, Journal of Statistical Physics **85**, 551 (1996).

[5] J. Kempe, Contemporary Physics **44**, 307 (2003), arXiv:0303081v1 [quant-ph].

[6] I. Bloch, J. Dalibard, and S. Nascimbene, Nature Physics **8**, 267 (2012).

[7] A. Ambainis, International Journal of Quantum Information **1**, 507 (2003).

[8] F. Magniez, A. Nayak, J. Roland, and M. Santha, SIAM Journal on Computing **40**, 142 (2011).

[9] T. Kitagawa, M. A. Broome, A. Fedrizzi, M. S. Rudner, E. Berg, I. Kassal, A. Aspuru-Guzik, E. Demler, and A. G. White, Nature communications **3**, 882 (2012).

[10] P. Arnault, G. Di Molfetta, M. Brachet, and F. Debbasch, Phys. Rev. A **94**, 012335 (2016).

[11] M. Genske, W. Alt, A. Steffen, A. H. Werner, R. F. Werner, D. Meschede, and A. Alberti, Physical review letters **110**, 190601 (2013).

[12] A. Schreiber, A. Gábris, P. P. Rohde, K. Laiho, M. Štefaňák, V. Potoček, C. Hamilton, I. Jex, and C. Silberhorn, Science **336**, 55 (2012).

[13] R. Côté, A. Russell, E. E. Eyler, and P. L. Gould, New Journal of Physics **8**, 156 (2006).

[14] L. Sansoni, F. Sciarrino, G. Vallone, P. Mataloni, A. Crespi, R. Ramponi, and R. Osellame, Physical review letters **108**, 010502 (2012).

[15] A. Schreiber, K. Cassemiro, V. Potoček, A. Gábris, I. Jex, and C. Silberhorn, Physical review letters **106**, 180403 (2011).

[16] G. Di Molfetta and F. Debbasch, Quantum Studies: Mathematics and Foundations **3**, 293 (2016).

[17] M. a. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Cambridge University Press* (2011) p. 702, arXiv:arXiv:1011.1669v3.

[18] Y. Omar, N. Paunkovic, L. Sheridan, and S. Bose, Physical Review A **74**, 042304 (2006), arXiv:0411065 [quant-ph].

[19] F. Evers and A. D. Mirlin, Reviews of Modern Physics **80**, 1355 (2008), arXiv:0707.4378.

[20] A. Lagendijk, B. Van Tiggelen, and D. S. Wiersma, Phys. Today **62**, 24 (2009).